Comment on perihelion advance due to cosmological constant

S. S. Ovcherenko
Novosibirsk State University, 630 090, Novosibirsk, Russia

Z. K. Silagadze
*Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics and Novosibirsk State University, 630 090, Novosibirsk, Russia**

We comment on the recent paper "Note on the perihelion/periastron advance due to cosmological constant" by H. Arakida (Int. J. Theor. Phys. 52 (2013) 1408-1414) and provide simple derivations both of the main result of this paper and of the Adkins-McDonnell's precession formula, on which this main result is based.

Keywords: Celestial Mechanics, Gravitation, Cosmological Constant, Dark Energy

arXiv:1511.04829v1 [gr-qc] 16 Nov 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently Hideyoshi Arakida in the interesting paper [1] clarified some confusion existing in the literature concerning the eccentricity dependence of the perihelion/periastron advance of celestial bodies due to the cosmological constant Λ. He showed that the correct expression for the perihelion/periastron shift per period is

$$\Delta\Theta_p = \frac{\pi c^2 \Lambda a^3}{GM}\sqrt{1-e^2}, \tag{1}$$

where a is the semi-major axis of the orbit and e is the eccentricity. This result was obtained in [1] by the help of the general formula

$$\Delta\Theta_p = -\frac{2p}{\alpha e^2}\int\limits_{-1}^{1}\frac{dV(z)}{dz}\,\frac{z}{\sqrt{1-z^2}}\,dz \tag{2}$$

for the perihelion/periastron shift per period due to a small central-force perturbation

$$V(z) = V(r(z)) = V\left(\frac{p}{1+ez}\right), \quad p = a(1-e^2),$$

to the Newtonian potential $V_0(r) = -\alpha/r$, $\alpha = GMm$. The formula (2) was first obtained in [2]. Note that, contrary to [1], but in accord with [2], our $V(r)$ is the perturbation potential energy, not the perturbation potential as in [1], and therefore it includes the mass of the orbiting particle m.

Now we demonstrate that suitably modified Landau and Lifshitz's approach [3] allows to simply derive both (1) and (2).

*Electronic address: silagadze@inp.nsk.su

II. LANDAU AND LIFSHITZ'S APPROACH

Landau and Lifshitz provide [3] the following expression for $\Delta\Theta_p$ (see solution of the Problem 3 in §15):

$$\Delta\Theta_p = \frac{\partial}{\partial L}\int\limits_{r_{min}}^{r_{max}}\frac{2mV(r)}{\sqrt{2m\left(E+\frac{\alpha}{r}\right)-\frac{L^2}{r^2}}}\,dr, \tag{3}$$

where L is the angular momentum, E is the total energy, and the integration is over the unperturbed Keplerian orbit. A simple derivation of (3) can be found in [3]. Using

$$\frac{dr}{\sqrt{2m\left(E+\frac{\alpha}{r}\right)-\frac{L^2}{r^2}}} = \frac{1}{m}\,dt,$$

and extending the integration over the whole orbital period T, it is convenient to rewrite (3) in the following form [4]

$$\Delta\Theta_p = \frac{\partial}{\partial L}\int\limits_0^T V(r(t))\,dt = \frac{\partial}{\partial L}\left(T < V >\right), \tag{4}$$

where

$$< V >= \frac{1}{T}\int\limits_0^T V(r(t))\,dt$$

is the time-average value of the perturbation potential energy over the unperturbed orbit. Note that this time-averaged value is a function of L and E and it is the total energy E that is to be kept constant when taking the partial derivative $\partial/\partial L$ in (4).

To apply (4) to the problem considered in [1], with the perturbation potential energy

$$V(r) = -\frac{1}{6}\Lambda m c^2 r^2, \tag{5}$$

let us use the following parametrization of the unperturbed motion on the Keplerian ellipse [3]:

$$t = \sqrt{\frac{ma^3}{\alpha}}(\xi - e\,\sin\xi), \quad r = a(1-e\,\cos\xi), \tag{6}$$

where the parameter ξ changes from 0 to 2π. As a result, we get

$$\Delta\Theta_p = -\frac{1}{6}\Lambda m c^2 a^2 \sqrt{\frac{ma^3}{\alpha}}\frac{\partial}{\partial L}\int\limits_0^{2\pi}(1-e\,\cos\xi)^3\,d\xi, \qquad (7)$$

and after the elementary evaluation of the integral,

$$\Delta\Theta_p = -\frac{\pi}{3}\Lambda m c^2 a^2 \sqrt{\frac{ma^3}{\alpha}}\frac{\partial}{\partial L}\left(1+\frac{3}{2}e^2\right). \qquad (8)$$

But

$$e^2 = 1+\frac{2EL^2}{m\alpha^2} = 1-\frac{L^2}{m\alpha a},$$

and, therefore,

$$\frac{\partial e^2}{\partial L} = -\frac{2L}{m\alpha a} = -2\sqrt{\frac{1-e^2}{m\alpha a}}, \qquad (9)$$

which together with (8) imply the validity of (1):

$$\Delta\Theta_p = \frac{\pi\Lambda m c^2 a^3}{\alpha}\sqrt{1-e^2} = \frac{\pi\Lambda c^2 a^3}{GM}\sqrt{1-e^2}. \qquad (10)$$

It remains to clarify how the Adkins-McDonnell's precession formula (2) can be obtained from (4). Using again the parametrization (6), we can write (with $r(\xi)=a(1-e\,\cos\xi)$)

$$\Delta\Theta_p = \sqrt{\frac{ma^3}{\alpha}}\frac{\partial}{\partial L}\int\limits_0^{2\pi}V(r(\xi))\,(1-e\,\cos\xi)\,d\xi. \qquad (11)$$

Because $\cos(2\pi-\xi)=\cos\xi$, this can be rewritten in the form

$$\Delta\Theta_p = 2\sqrt{\frac{ma^3}{\alpha}}\frac{\partial}{\partial L}\int\limits_0^{\pi}V(r(\xi))\,(1-e\,\cos\xi)\,d\xi. \qquad (12)$$

Now let us apply the Leibniz integral rule (differentiation under the integral sign) to get

$$\Delta\Theta_p = 2\sqrt{\frac{ma^3}{\alpha}}\frac{\partial e}{\partial L}\times \left[\int\limits_0^{\pi}V'(r(\xi))\,(-a\cos\xi)(1-e\,\cos\xi)\,d\xi + I\right], \qquad (13)$$

where

$$I = -\int\limits_0^{\pi}V(r(\xi))\,\cos\xi\,d\xi = -\int\limits_0^{\pi}V(r(\xi))\,d(\sin\xi), \qquad (14)$$

and $V'(r)=\frac{dV(r)}{dr}$. Integration by parts, along with

$$\frac{dV(r(\xi))}{d\xi} = ea\,V'(r(\xi))\,\sin\xi,$$

allows to rewrite (14) in the form

$$I = ea\int\limits_0^{\pi}V'(r(\xi))\,\sin^2\xi\,d\xi. \qquad (15)$$

Substituting (15) into (13), we get

$$\Delta\Theta_p = 2\sqrt{\frac{ma^3}{\alpha}}\,\frac{\partial e}{\partial L}\,a\int\limits_0^{\pi}(e-\cos\xi)\,V'(r(\xi))\,d\xi. \qquad (16)$$

At this stage, let us introduce a new integration variable z:

$$z = \frac{\cos\xi - e}{1-e\,\cos\xi}, \quad \cos\xi = \frac{z+e}{1+e\,z}. \qquad (17)$$

It follows from (17) that

$$e-\cos\xi = -\frac{(1-e^2)z}{1+e\,z}, \;\; 1-e\,\cos\xi = \frac{1-e^2}{1+e\,z}, \quad \sin^2\xi = \frac{(1-z^2)(1-e^2)}{(1+e\,z)^2}, \qquad (18)$$

and

$$d\xi = -\frac{1-e^2}{(1+e\,z)^2}\,\frac{1}{\sin\xi}\,dz = -\frac{\sqrt{1-e^2}}{(1+e\,z)\sqrt{1-z^2}}\,dz. \qquad (19)$$

Besides $\frac{dV(r(z))}{dz}$ equals to

$$\frac{d}{dz}V\left(\frac{a(1-e^2)}{1+e\,z}\right) = V'(r(z))\left(-\frac{a\,e\,(1-e^2)}{(1+e\,z)^2}\right), \qquad (20)$$

that allows to express $V'(r(\xi)) = V'(a(1-e\,\cos\xi)) = V'(r(z))$ in terms of $\frac{dV(r(z))}{dz}$. After taking all these relations into account, (16) becomes

$$\Delta\Theta_p = 2\sqrt{\frac{ma^3}{\alpha}}\,\frac{1}{e}\frac{\partial e}{\partial L}\,\sqrt{1-e^2}\int\limits_{-1}^{1}\frac{dV(r(z))}{dz}\frac{z\,dz}{\sqrt{1-z^2}}, \qquad (21)$$

and this coincides to the Adkins-McDonnell's precession formula (2), because, due to (9),

$$2\sqrt{\frac{ma^3}{\alpha}}\,\frac{1}{e}\,\frac{\partial e}{\partial L}\,\sqrt{1-e^2} = -2\frac{a(1-e^2)}{\alpha\,e^2} = -\frac{2p}{\alpha\,e^2}.$$

III. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Various approaches to account the influence of the cosmological constant on the celestial dynamics can be found in references cited in [1]. Kotkin and Serbo's variant (4) of the Landau and Lifshitz's precession formula and the parametrization (6) of the unperturbed motion on the Keplerian ellipse provide, probably, the simplest way to calculate the perihelion/periastron advance of celestial bodies due to the cosmological constant in the framework of the Schwarzschild-de Sitter (Kottler) spacetime. This approach also allows a simple derivation of the Adkins-McDonnell's precession formula (2) (another simple derivation of this formula, based on the precession of the Hamilton's vector, was given in [5]).

Acknowledgments

The work is supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation and in part by Russian Federation President Grant for the support of scientific schools NSh-2479.2014.2.

[1] H. Arakida, Note on the perihelion/periastron advance due to cosmological constant, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **52**, 1408 (2013) [arXiv:1212.6289 [gr-qc]].

[2] G. S. Adkins and J. McDonnell, Orbital precession due to central-force perturbations, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 082001 (2007) [gr-qc/0702015].

[3] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, Mechanics (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 2004).

[4] G. L. Kotkin and V. G. Serbo, Collection of problems in classical mechanics (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1971).

[5] O. I. Chashchina and Z. K. Silagadze, Remark on orbital precession due to central-force perturbations, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 107502 (2008) [arXiv:0802.2431 [gr-qc]].